



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,925	08/27/2003	Moshe Flam	FR919980066US2	4117

7590 01/25/2006
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/648,925	Applicant(s) FLAM, MOSHE	
	Examiner Matthew J. Ludwig	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/27/03 7/1/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 8/27/03.
2. The examiner acknowledges applicant's priority claim to application no. 09444683, filed 11/22/1999.
3. Claims 1-17 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

In reference to independent claims 1 and 13, the claims recite the phrase '*substantially without reference to language support provided by the operating system or browser*'. The use of the word *substantially* fails to provide the examiner with a definite limitation and does not preclude the examiner from incorporating an operating system or browser in the rejection of the claims. Finally, the examiner suggests modifying the limitation to prevent the broad reading of the independent claims when read as a whole.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by M.A. Batey et al., “Dual Orientation Display”, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, IBM, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 814-819, July 1979.**

In reference to independent claim 1, Batey teaches:

Visual display units (VDUs) are required which can handle both left to right (LTOR) Latin languages and right to left (RTOL) languages such as Hebrew, Arabic, and Farsi. See Batey, page 814. The visual display units are visual windows presented to an operator and on a computer. The visual display units inherently teach a window for presenting information to a user. Such a window would allow the operator to input and display languages utilizing the automatic reverse feature (compare to “*opening a window on the display*”).

In a visual display unit (VDU) equipped for handling such (RTOL) languages, an automatic reverse feature permits the entering of data into numeric fields (LTOR) while the (VDU) is in overall (RTOL) orientation (compare to “*receiving a string of codes, each code corresponding to a character in a passage of text, at least...*”). See Batey, page 817.

This permits the use of overall LTOR orientation where data entry is predominantly numeric with only occasional RTOL text, or overall RTOL orientation where data entry is predominantly RTOL text with only occasional numeric input (compare to “displaying the

Art Unit: 2178

characters corresponding to the codes in the window such that the passage of text is displayed with all portions thereof arranged in respectively appropriate direction”). See Batey, page 818.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Batey teaches:

The current orientation is set as LTOR or RTOL and then determines the data entry direction when last in current orientation and sets the state of auto-reverse and manual-reverse. See Batey, page 816.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Batey teaches:

In a visual display unit (VDU) equipped for handling such RTOL languages, an automatic reverse feature permits the entering of data into numeric fields LTOR while the VDU is in overall RTOL orientation. See Batey, page 817.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Batey teaches:

The reference fails to explicitly state the languages are transmitted over a computer network; however, it is implied when the user is provided with a computer, operator interface, and a means of interacting with application programs within a state machine. See Batey, page 818.

In reference to claims 13-17, the claims recite the apparatus comprising instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in 1, 2, 4 and 5. In further view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 3, 7, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over M.A. Batey et al., "Dual Orientation Display", IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, IBM, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 814-819, July 1979 in view of Mathur et al., USPN 6,832,381 filed (4/28/2000).**

In reference to dependent claim 3, Batey teaches:

The use of overall LTOR orientation where data entry is predominantly numeric with only occasional RTOL text, or overall RTOL orientation where data entry is predominantly RTOL text with only occasional numeric input. However, the selection of different languages is not performed by a user with a keyboard displayed on a screen. Mathur teaches a set of application program interfaces for a resource-limited environment. The API's provide a mechanism for a computer application to interface with various components and modules of an operating system for a resource-limited environment. More specifically, the reference provides the display of a keyboard for receiving multiple languages. See column 11, lines 1-35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Batey and Mathur before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the language support program taught by Batey to include the keyboard display of Mathur, because it would have extended the

application program and given the user an added benefit of utilizing the language support device with or without a keyboard.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Batey teaches:

An operation entering Arabic text with LTOR insertions, the orientation will be switched to RTOL and the reverse key used for LTOR insertions. If a message from a controller is received in English, this will be displayed as a mirror image. See Batey, page 815. The reference fails to explicitly state the characters being in an area of the display overlain by the window; however, Fukuda discloses a window system constructed by a checking section to check an overlapping state of a plurality of windows displayed on a display. See column 6, lines 45-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Batey and Fukuda before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the window display methods taught by Batey and utilized overlapping windows of Fukuda because it would have provided a user with multiple windows that would allow for a strict window management means in a natural language support system.

In reference to claims 10-12, the claims recite similar limitations used for performing the language methods as claimed in dependent claim 3 and 7. In further view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2178

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over M.A. Batey et al., "Dual Orientation Display", IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, IBM, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 814-819, July 1979 in view of Mathur et al., USPN 6,832,381 filed (4/28/2000) and further in view of Fukuda et al., USPN 6,163,318 filed (9/6/1995).

In reference to dependent claim 8, Batey teaches:

An operation entering Arabic text with LTOR insertions, the orientation will be switched to RTOL and the reverse key used for LTOR insertions. If a message from a controller is received in English, this will be displayed as a mirror image. See Batey, page 815. The reference fails to explicitly state the characters being in an area of the display overlain by the window; however, Fukuda discloses a window system constructed by a checking section to check an overlapping state of a plurality of windows displayed on a display. More specifically, the reference teaches a way to read out coordinates of the windows. See column 5, lines 1-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Batey and Fukuda before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the window display methods taught by Batey and utilized overlapping windows of Fukuda because it would have provided a user with multiple windows that would allow for a strict window management means in a natural language support system.


In reference to claims 9, the claims recite similar limitations used for performing the language methods as claimed in dependent claim 8. In further view of the following, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ML
January 20, 2006

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER